DED	ACTE	D VE	DCT	
KEL	ACIE	:D VE	K2T	יוט

RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company					
RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY SHEET					
Section A – Management [68.15]					
Management system developed and implemented as provided in 40 CFR 68.15? Comments:	⊠S	□М	□U	□N/A	
Has the owner or operator:					
1. Developed a management system to oversee the implementation of the risk management program of	elements? [68.15(a)]	✓Y	□N	□N/A	
2. Assigned a qualified person or position that has the overall responsibility for the development, impintegration of the risk management program elements? [68.15(b)]	elementation, and	ØY	□N	□N/A	
3. Documented other persons responsible for implementing individual requirements of the risk managed defined the lines of authority through an organization chart or <b>similar document</b> ? [68.15(c)]	gement program and	✓Y	□N	□N/A	
Section B: Hazard Assessment [68.20-68.42]					
Hazard assessment conducted and documented as provided in 40 CFR 68.20-68.42? Comments:	□S	⊠M	□U	□N/A	
Hazard Assessment: Offsite consequence analysis parameters [68.22]					
<ol> <li>Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for a worst-case scenario: [68.22(a)]</li> <li>✓ For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]</li> <li>☐ For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]; or</li> <li>☐ For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a) For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]</li> <li>Used the following endpoints for offsite consequence analysis for an alternative release scenario: [a For toxics: the endpoints provided in Appendix A of 40 CFR Part 68? [68.22(a)(1)]</li> <li>☐ For flammables: an explosion resulting in an overpressure of 1 psi? [68.22(a)(2)(i)]</li> <li>☐ For flammables: a fire resulting in a radiant heat/exposure of 5 kw/m² for 40 seconds? [68.22(a)(2)(a)]</li> </ol>	(a)(2)(ii)] documents or other (68.22(a)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A	
☐ For flammables: a concentration resulting in a lower flammability limit, as provided in NFPA generally recognized sources? [68.22(a)(2)(iii)]					
3. Used appropriate wind speeds and stability classes for the release analysis? [68.22(b)]		✓Y	□N	□N/A	
4. Used appropriate ambient temperature and humidity values for the release analysis? [68.22(c)]		✓Y	□N	□N/A	
5. Used appropriate values for the height of the release for the release analysis? [68.22(d)]		✓Y	□N	□N/A	
6. Used appropriate surface roughness values for the release analysis? [68.22(e)]		✓Y	□N	□N/A	
7. Do tables and models, used for dispersion analysis of toxic substances, appropriately account for debuoyant gases? [68.22(f)]	ense or neutrally	ØY	□N	□N/A	
8. Were liquids, other than gases liquefied by refrigeration only, considered to be released at the high temperature, based on data for the previous three years appropriate for a stationary source, or at prowhichever is higher? [68.22(g)]		□Y	□N	⊠N/A	

RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company					
RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSE	D PEN	ALTY	SHEET		
Hazard Assessment: Worst-case release scenario analysis [68.25]					
9. Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario estimated to create the greatest distance to an endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated toxic substance from covered processes under worst-case conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(i)]	ØY	□N	□N/A		
10. Analyzed and reported in the RMP one worst-case release scenario estimated to create the greatest distance to an endpoint resulting from an accidental release of a regulated <b>flammable</b> substance from covered processes under worst-case conditions? [68.25(a)(2)(ii)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A		
11. Analyzed and reported in the RMP additional worst-case release scenarios for a hazard class if the worst-case release from another covered process at the stationary source potentially affects public receptors different from those potentially affected by the worst-case release scenario developed under 68.25(a)(2)(i) or 68.25(a)(2)(ii)? [68.25(a)(2)(iii)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		
12. Has the owner or operator determined the worst-case release quantity to be the greater of the following: [68.25(b)]	₫Y	$\square N$	□N/A		
☑ If released from a vessel, the greatest amount held in a single vessel, taking into account administrative controls that limit the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(1)]					
☐ If released from a pipe, the greatest amount held in the pipe, taking into account administrative controls that limit the maximum quantity? [68.25(b)(2)]					
13.a. Has the owner or operator for <u>toxic substances</u> that are <u>normally gases</u> at <u>ambient temperature and handled as a gas</u>	or liquid	under	pressure:		
13.a.(1) Assumed the whole quantity in the vessel or pipe would be released as a gas over 10 minutes? [68.25(c)(1)]	✓Y	□N	□N/A		
13.a.(2) Assumed the release rate to be the total quantity divided by 10, if there are no passive mitigation systems in place? [68.25(c)(1)]	ØY	□N	□N/A		
13.b. Has the owner or operator for <u>toxic gases</u> handled as <u>refrigerated liquids at ambient pressure</u> :					
13.b.(1) Assumed the substance would be released as a gas in 10 minutes, if not contained by passive mitigation systems or if the contained pool would have a depth of 1 cm or less? [68.25(c)(2)(i)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A		
13.b.(2) [Optional for owner / operator ] Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool, if the released substance would be contained by passive mitigation systems in a pool with a depth greater than 1 cm? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A		
13.b.(3) Calculated the volatilization rate at the boiling point of the substance and at the conditions specified in 68.25(d)? [68.25(c)(2)(ii)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A		
13.c. Has the owner or operator for <u>toxic substances</u> that are <u>normally liquids at ambient temperature</u> :					
13.c.(1) Assumed the quantity in the vessel or pipe would be spilled instantaneously to form a liquid pool? [68.25(d)(1)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A		
13.c.(2) Determined the surface area of the pool by assuming that the liquid spreads to 1 cm deep, if there is no passive mitigation system in place that would serve to contain the spill and limit the surface area, or if passive mitigation is in place, was the surface area of the contained liquid used to calculate the volatilization rate? [68.25(d)(1)(i)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		
13.c.(3) Taken into account the actual surface characteristics, if the release would occur onto a surface that is not paved or smooth? [68.25(d)(1)(ii)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A		
13.c.(4) Determined the volatilization rate by accounting for the highest daily maximum temperature in the past three years, the temperature of the substance in the vessel, and the concentration of the substance if the liquid spilled is a mixture or solution? [68.25(d)(2)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		
13.c.(5) Determined the rate of release to air from the volatilization rate of the liquid pool? [68.25(d)(3)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A		

RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company			
RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSE	D PEN	ALTY	SHEET
13.c.(6) Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request?  [68.25(d)(3)]	□Υ	□N	⊠N/A
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)]			
13.d. Has the owner or operator for <u>flammables</u> :			
13.d.(1) Assumed the quantity in a vessel(s) of flammable gas held as a gas or liquid under pressure or refrigerated gas released to an undiked area vaporizes resulting in a vapor cloud explosion? [68.25(e)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
13.d.(2) For refrigerated gas released to a contained area or liquids released below their atmospheric boiling point, assumed the quantity volatilized in 10 minutes results in a vapor cloud? [68.25(f)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A
13.d.(3) Assumed a yield factor of 10% of the available energy is released in the explosion for determining the distance to the explosion endpoint, if the model used is based on TNT-equivalent methods? [68.25(e)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A
14. Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the endpoints? [68.25(g)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
15. Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, any other publicly available techniques that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.25(g)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)] <b>DEGADIS</b>			
16. Ensured that the passive mitigation system, if considered, is capable of withstanding the release event triggering the scenario and will still function as intended? [68.25(h)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
17. Considered also the following factors in selecting the worst-case release scenarios: [68.25(i)]	□Y	$\square N$	<b>☑</b> N/A
☐ Smaller quantities handled at higher process temperature or pressure? [68.25(i)(1)]			
□ Proximity to the boundary of the stationary source? [68.25(i)(2)]			
Hazard Assessment: Alternative release scenario analysis [68.28]			
18. Identified and analyzed at least one alternative release scenario for each regulated toxic substance held in a covered process(es) and at least one alternative release scenario to represent all flammable substances held in covered processes? [68.28(a)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
19. Selected a scenario: [68.28(b)]	ØY	□N	□N/A
☑ That is more likely to occur than the worst-case release scenario under 68.25? [68.28(b)(1)(i)]			
☐ That will reach an endpoint off-site, unless no such scenario exists? [68.28(b)(1)(ii)]			
20. Considered release scenarios which included, but are not limited to, the following: [68.28(b)(2)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
☑ Transfer hose releases due to splits or sudden hose uncoupling? [68.28(b)(2)(i)]			
□ Process piping releases from failures at flanges, joints, welds, valves and valve seals, and drains or bleeds? [68.28(b)(2)(ii)] <b>NA</b>			
☑ Process vessel or pump releases due to cracks, seal failure, or drain, bleed, or plug failure? [68.28(b)(2)(iii)]			
□ Vessel overfilling and spill, or overpressurization and venting through relief valves or rupture disks? [68.28(b)(2)(iv)] The NH <sub>3</sub> is filled by RR personnel directly from a safeguarded rail car to the tankNA			
☐ Shipping container mishandling and breakage or puncturing leading to a spill? [68.28(b)(2)(v)] <b>NA</b>			

RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company				
RIS	SK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSE	D PEN	ALTY	SHEET
21.	Used the parameters defined in 68.22 to determine distance to the endpoints? [68.28(c)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
22.	Determined the rate of release to air by using the methodology in the RMP Offsite Consequence Analysis Guidance, <b>any other publicly available techniques</b> that account for the modeling conditions and are recognized by industry as applicable as part of current practices, or proprietary models that account for the modeling conditions may be used provided the owner or operator allows the implementing agency access to the model and describes model features and differences from publicly available models to local emergency planners upon request? [68.28(c)]	ØY	□N	□N/A
	What modeling technique did the owner or operator use? [68.25(g)] <b>DEGADIS</b>			
23.	Ensured that the passive and active mitigation systems, if considered, are capable of withstanding the release event triggering the scenario and will be functional? [68.28(d)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A
24.	Considered the following factors in selecting the alternative release scenarios: [68.28(e)]	₫Y	$\square N$	$\square N/A$
	☐ The five-year accident history provided in 68.42? [68.28(e)(1)]			
	☑ Failure scenarios identified under 68.50? [68.28(e)(2)]			
Haz	ard Assessment: Defining off-site impacts-Population [68.30]			
25.	Estimated population that would be included in the distance to the endpoint in the RMP based on a circle with the point of release at the center? [68.30(a)] <b>Using the 1990 Census</b>	₫Y	□N	□N/A
26.	Identified the presence of institutions, parks and recreational areas, major commercial, office, and industrial buildings in the RMP? [68.30(b)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
27.	Used most recent Census data, or other updated information to estimate the population? [68.30(c)] 1990 Census	□Y	⊠N	□N/A
28.	Estimated the population to two significant digits? [68.30(d)]	₫Y	$\square$ N	□N/A
Hazard Assessment: Defining off-site impacts–Environment [68.33]				
29.	Identified environmental receptors that would be included in the distance to the endpoint based on a circle with the point of release at the center? [68.33(a)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
30.	Relied on information provided on local U.S.G.S. maps, or on any data source containing U.S.G.S. data to identify environmental receptors? [Source may have used LandView to obtain information] [68.33(b)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A
Haz	zard Assessment: Review and update [68.36]			
31.	Reviewed and updated the off-site consequence analyses at least once every five years? [68.36(a)] The facility must review and update the OCAs immediately, as part of the required RMP update.	□Ү	⊠N (b) (5	□N/A
32.	Completed a revised analysis and submit a revised RMP within six months of a change in processes, quantities stored or handled, or any other aspect that might reasonably be expected to increase or decrease the distance to the endpoint by a factor of two or more? [68.36(b)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
Haz	card Assessment: Documentation [68.39]			
33.	For worst-case scenarios: a description of the vessel or pipeline and substance selected, assumptions and parameters used, the rationale for selection, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and passive mitigation on the release quantity and rate? [68.39(a)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
34.	For alternative release scenarios: a description of the scenarios identified, assumptions and parameters used, the rationale for the selection of specific scenarios, and anticipated effect of the administrative controls and mitigation on the release quantity and rate? [68.39(b)]	ØY	□N	□N/A
35.	Documentation of estimated quantity released, release rate, and duration of release? [68.39(c)]	ØY	□N	□N/A
36.	Methodology used to determine distance to endpoints? [68.39(d)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A

RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company					
RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY SH					
37.	Data used to estimate population and environmental receptors potentially affected? [68.39(e)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A	
Ha	zard Assessment: Five-year accident history [68.42]				
38.	Has the owner or operator included all accidental releases from covered processes that resulted in deaths, injuries, or significant property damage on site, or known offsite deaths, injuries, evacuations, sheltering in place, property damage, or environmental damage? [68.42(a)]	r 🗆 Y	□N	⊠N/A	
39.	Has the owner or operator reported the following information for each accidental release: [68.42(b)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A	
	□ Date, time, and approximate duration of the release? [68.42(b)(1)]				
	☐ Chemical(s) released? [68.42(b)(2)]				
	☐ Estimated quantity released in pounds and percentage weight in a mixture (toxics)? [68.42(b)(3)]				
	□ NAICS code for the process? [68.42(b)(4)]				
	$\Box$ The type of release event and its source? [68.42(b)(5)]				
	☐ Weather conditions (if known)? [68.42(b)(6)]				
	☐ On-site impacts? [68.42(b)(7)]				
	☐ Known offsite impacts? [68.42(b)(8)]				
	☐ Initiating event and contributing factors (if known)? [68.42(b)(9)]				
	☐ Whether offsite responders were notified (if known)? [68.42(b)(10)]				
	☐ Operational or process changes that resulted from investigation of the release? [68.42(b)(11)]				
Se	ection C: Prevention Program				
	plemented the Program 2 prevention requirements as provided in 40 CFR 68.48 - 68.60?	ΠМ	₫U	□N/A	
Pre	evention Program- Safety information [68.48]				
1.	Compiled and maintained the following up-to-date safety information, related to the regulated substances, processes and equipment: [68.48(a)]	s, ØY	□N	□N/A	
	☑ Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) that meet the requirements of the OSHA Hazard Communication Standar [29 CFR 1910.1200(g)]? [68.48(a)(1)]	rd			
	☑ Maximum intended inventory of equipment in which the regulated substances are stored or processed? [68.48(a)(2)]				
	☑ Safe upper and lower temperatures, pressures, flows, and compositions? [68.48(a)(3)]				
	☑ Equipment specifications? [68.48(a)(4)]				
	☑ Codes and standards used to design, build, and operate the process? [68.48(a)(5)]				
2.	Ensured the process is designed in compliance with recognized and generally accepted good engineering practices? [68.48(b)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A	
3.	Updated information if a major change has occurred that made the information inaccurate? [68.48(c)]	□Y	□N	☑N/A	
Pre	evention Program- Hazard review [68.50]	•			
4.	Has the owner or operator conducted a review of the hazards associated with the regulated substances, processes, an procedures? [68.50(a)]	nd 🗹 Y	□N	□N/A	

RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company				
RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY SE				
5.	Did the review identify:	₫Y	$\square N$	□N/A
	☑ The hazards associated with the process and regulated substances? [68.50(a)(1)]			
	☑ Opportunities for equipment malfunctions or human errors that could cause an accidental release? [68.50(a)(2)]			
	☐ The safeguards used or needed to control the hazards or prevent equipment malfunctions or human error? [68.50(a)(3)]			
	☑ Any steps used or needed to detect or monitor releases? [68.50(a)(4)]			
6.	Determined by inspecting all equipment that the processes are designed, fabricated, and operated in accordance with applicable standards or rules, if designed to meet industry standards or Federal or state design rules? [68.50(b)]	ØY	□N	□N/A
7.	Documented the results of the review? [68.50(c)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A
8.	Ensured that problems identified were resolved in a timely manner? [68.50(c)] Had no action item list naming who & when; the list did name what had to be done. The facility must review its records to determine whether and when recommendations had been addressed. To the extent that there may be any outstanding recommendations, the current hazard review (see 9 below) should determine whether actions may still be warranted.	□Y	⊠N	□N/A
9.	Updated the review at least once every five years or whenever a major change in the processes occurred? [68.50(d)] The facility must update the hazard review immediately as part of the required RMP update process.	□Y	⊠N (b) (5)	□N/A
10.	Resolved all issues identified in the review before startup of the changed process? [68.50(d)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A
Pre	vention Program- Operating procedures [68.52]			
11.	Has the owner or operator prepared written operating procedures that provide clear instructions or steps for safely conducting activities associated with each covered process consistent with the safety information for that process? (Operating procedures or instructions provided by equipment manufacturers or developed by persons or organizations knowledgeable about the process and equipment may be used as a basis for a stationary source's operating procedures.) [68.52(a)]	⊠Y	□N	□N/A
12.	Do the procedures address the following: [68.52(b)]	□Y	⊠N	□N/A
	☑ Initial startup? [68.52(b)(1)]			
	$\square$ Normal operations? [68.52(b)(2)]			
	$\square$ Temporary operations? [68.52(b)(3)]			
	☑ Emergency shutdown and operations? [68.52(b)(4)]			
	$\square$ Normal shutdown? [68.52(b)(5)]			
	☑ Startup following a normal or emergency shutdown or a major change that requires a hazard review? [68.52(b)(6)]			
	□ Consequences of deviations and steps required to correct or avoid deviations? [68.52(b)(7)] <b>Not Documented. Operating procedures must be updated to include consequences of deviation.</b>		(b) (5)	
	☑ Equipment inspections? [68.52(b)(8)]			
13.	Has the owner or operator ensured that the operating procedures have been updated, if necessary, whenever <b>a major change occurred</b> and prior to startup of the changed process? [68.52(c)	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A

## **RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist** Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY SHEET **Prevention Program - Training [68.54]** No Documentation 14. Certified that each employee presently operating a process, and each employee newly assigned to a covered process $\Box Y$ ØΝ □N/A have been trained or tested competent in the operating procedures provided in § 68.52 that pertain to their duties? (For those employees already operating a process on June 21, 1999, the owner or operator may certify in writing that the employee has the required knowledge, skills, and abilities to safely carry out the duties and responsibilities as provided in the operating procedures.) [68.54(a)] OJT experience only. The facility must improve record keeping practices for operator training. 15. Provided refresher training at least every three years, or more often if necessary, to each employee operating a process, ☑N/A $\Box Y$ $\square N$ to ensure that the employee understands and adheres to the current operating procedures of the process? [68.54(b)] 16. Determined, in consultation with the employees operating the process, the appropriate frequency of refresher training? $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ☑N/A [68.54(b)] ☑N/A 17. Certified that each employee was trained in any updated or new procedures prior to startup of a process after a major $\Box Y$ $\square N$ change? [68.54(d)] Prevention Program - Maintenance [68.56] No Documentation 18. Prepared and implemented procedures to maintain the on-going mechanical integrity of the process equipment? $\Box Y$ ΜN □N/A [68.56(a)] The facility must develop and document compliance with a mechanical integrity program for the covered processes. 19. Trained or caused to be trained each employee, involved in maintaining the on-going mechanical integrity of the $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ☑N/A process, in the hazards of the process, in how to avoid or correct unsafe conditions, and in the procedures applicable to the employee's job tasks? [68.56(b)] 20. Has every maintenance contractor ensured that each contract maintenance employee is trained to perform the $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ☑N/A maintenance procedures developed? [68.56(c)] 21. Has the owner or operator performed or caused to be performed inspections and tests on process equipment that follow $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ✓N/A recognized and generally accepted engineering practices? [68.56(d)] Prevention Program - Compliance audits [68.58] No Documentation – a compliance audit was never done 22. Has the owner or operator certified that compliance audits are conducted at least every three years to verify that the $\Box Y$ $\square$ N □N/A procedures and practices are adequate and are being followed? [68.58(a)] The facility must immediately conduct a compliance audit and establish safeguards to ensure that one is conducted at least once every three years thereafter. $\Box Y$ **☑**N/A 23. Has compliance audit been conducted by at least one person knowledgeable in the process? [68.58(b)] 24. Has the owner operator developed a report of the audits findings? [68.58(c)] $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ✓N/A 25. Has the owner or operator promptly determined and documented an appropriate response to each of the findings of the $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ☑N/A audit and documented that deficiencies had been corrected? [68.58(d)] 26. Has the owner or operator retained the two most recent compliance audit reports, unless more than five years old? $\Box Y$ $\square N$ ☑N/A [68.58(e)]**Prevention Program - Incident investigation [68.60] No Documentation** 27. Has the owner or operator investigated each incident that resulted in, or could reasonably have resulted in a $\Box Y$ ΜN □N/A catastrophic release? [68.60(a)] $\Box Y$ **☑**N/A 28. Were all incident investigations initiated not later than 48 hours following the incident? [68.60(b)] $\square N$

RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company						
RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY SHEET						
29. Was a summary prepared at the conclusion of every investigation, which included: [68.60(c)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A			
☐ Date of incident? [68.60(c)(1)]						
☐ Date investigation began? [68.60(c)(2)]						
☐ A description of incident? [68.60(c)(3)]						
$\Box$ The factors that contributed to the incident? [68.60(c)(4)]						
$\square$ Any recommendations resulting from the investigation? [68.60(c)(5)]						
30. Has the owner or operator promptly addressed and resolved the investigation findings and recommendations, and are the resolutions and corrective actions documented? [68.60(d)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A			
31. Has the owner or operator reviewed the finding with all affected personnel whose job tasks are affected by the findings? [68.60(e)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A			
32. Has the owner or operator retained investigation summaries for five years? [68.60(f)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A			
Section D - Emergency Response [68.90 - 68.95]						
Developed and implemented an emergency response program as provided in 40 CFR 68.90-68.95?	M [	□U	□N/A			
1. Is the facility designated as a "first responder" in case of an accidental release of regulated substances"	ПΥ	ØN	□N/A			
1.a. If the facility is not a first responder:						
1.a.(1) For stationary sources with any regulated substances held in a process above threshold quantities, is the source included in the community emergency response plan developed under 42 U.S.C. 11003? [68.90(b)(1)]	ØY	□N	□N/A			
1.a.(2) For stationary sources with only regulated <b>flammable</b> substances held in a process above threshold quantities, has the owner or operator coordinated response actions with the local fire department? [68.90(b)(2)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A			
1.a.(3) Are appropriate mechanisms in place to notify emergency responders when there is need for a response? [68.90(b)(3)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A			
2. An emergency response plan is maintained at the stationary source and contains the following? [68.95(a)(1)]	⊠Y	$\square$ N	□N/A			
☑ Procedures for informing the public and local emergency response agencies about accidental releases? [68.95(a)(1)(i)]						
☑ Documentation of proper first-aid and emergency medical treatment necessary to treat accidental human exposures? [68.95(a)(1)(ii)]						
☑ Procedures and measures for emergency response after an accidental release of a regulated substance? [68.95(a)(1)(iii)]						
3. The emergency response plan contains procedures for the use of emergency response equipment and for its inspection, testing, and maintenance? [68.95(a)(2)]	ПΥ	□N	⊠N/A			
4. The emergency response plan requires, and there is documentation of, training for all employees in relevant procedures? [68.95(a)(3)]	ØY	□N	□N/A			
5. The owner or operator has developed and implemented procedures to review and update, as appropriate, the emergency response plan to reflect changes at the stationary source and ensure that employees are informed of changes? [68.95(a)(4)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A			
6. Did the owner or operator use a written plan that complies with other Federal contingency plan regulations or is consistent with the approach in the National Response Team's Integrated Contingency Plan Guidance ("One Plan")? If so, does the plan include the elements provided in paragraph (a) of 68.95, and also complies with paragraph (c) of 68.95? [68.95(b)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A			
•						

	RMP Program Level 2 Process Checklist Facility Name: West Chemical & Fertilizer Company							
	RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM INSPECTION FINDINGS, ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND PROPOSED PENALTY SHEET							
7.	Has the emergency response plan been coordinated with the community emergency response plan developed under EPCRA? [68.95(c)]	ØY	□N	□N/A				
Se	ection E – Risk Management Plan [40 CFR 68.190 – 68.195]							
1.	Does the single registration form include, for each covered process, the name and CAS number of each regulated substance held above the threshold quantity in the process, the maximum quantity of each regulated substance or mixture in the process (in pounds) to two significant digits, the five- or six-digit NAICS code that most closely corresponds to the process and the Program level of the process? [68.160(b)(7)]	₫Y	□N	□N/A				
2.	Has the owner or operator reviewed and updated the RMP and submitted it to EPA [68.190(a)]? Reason for update:	□Y	⊠N	□N/A				
	Five-year update. [68.190(b)(1)] The facility must immediately prepare and submit an updated Risk Management Plan. Go to <a href="http://yosemite.epa.gov/oswer/ceppoweb.nsf/content/RMPsubmission.htm">http://yosemite.epa.gov/oswer/ceppoweb.nsf/content/RMPsubmission.htm</a> for information and tools.		(b) (5)					
	☐ Within three years of a newly regulated substance listing. [68.190(b)(2)]			<del></del>				
	At the time a new regulated substance is first present in an already regulated process above threshold quantities. [68.190(b)(3)]							
	☐ At the time a regulated substance is first present in an new process above threshold quantities. [68.190(b)(4)]							
	☐ Within six months of a change requiring revised PHA or hazard review. [68.190(b)(5)]							
	☐ Within six months of a change requiring a revised OCA as provided in 68.36. [68.190(b)(6)]							
	☐ Within six months of a change that alters the Program level that applies to any covered process. [68.190(b)(7)]							
3.	If the owner or operator experienced an accidental release that met the five-year accident history reporting criteria (as described at 68.42) subsequent to April 9, 2004, did the owner or operator submit the information required at 68.168, 68.170(j) and 68.175(l) within six months of the release or by the time the RMP was updated as required at 68.190, whichever was earlier. [68.195(a)]	□Y	□N	⊠N/A				
4.	If the emergency contact information required at 68.160(b)(6) has changed since June 21, 2004, did the owner or operator submit corrected information within thirty days of the change? [68.195(b)]	□Ү	□N	⊠N/A				
	Total Unadjusted P	Penalty	- (b) (5	)				
	2.00							